

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/009,732	04/23/2002	Patrice Gotteland	022701-976	6025	
21839 7	590 05/12/2004		EXAMINER		
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P POST OFFICE BOX 1404			BOS, STEVEN J		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1754		

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany							
		10/009,732	GOTTELAND ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	 			
	T. 1111 NO DATE 441	Steven Bos	1754				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with th	ie correspondence address				
THE - Exte after - if the - if NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed  days will be considered timely.  from the mailing date of this communication.  ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 Ma</u>	arch 2004.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-13</u> is/are withdrawn Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>5-7</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>8</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	۲.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) objected to by the	ne Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment	i(s)						
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/009,732

Art Unit: 1754

The examiner's amendment discussed with George F. Lesmes will not be entered due to the discovery of relevant prior art, which is discussed below.

It is noted that in the specification, pp. 7,8, recitations of "graph" or "graphs" are found which appear to refer to the instant figures. It is suggested that these be deleted and replaced with – Figure – or – Figures --, respectively.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Application/Control Number: 10/009,732

Art Unit: 1754

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly '394.

Kelly suggests the instantly claimed process of recycling the catalyst in an oxidation reaction of an organic compound by treating the catalyst solution with an ion exchange resin which is the same resin as is instantly disclosed, Eichrome Diphonix, and therefore would appear to comprise diphosphonic acid groups as well as sulfonic groups. See the bottom of col. 10 and col. 1.

Claim 8 is objected to as dependent on a rejected base claim.

Applicant's arguments filed March 15, 2004 have been fully considered and they are persuasive. Claims 1-4 are allowable over the cited prior art of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Bos whose telephone number is 571-272-1350. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8AM-6PM but is on increased flexitime sch.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven Bos

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1754

sjb